



# Shelby County Tennessee

Mark H. Luttrell, Jr., Mayor

## Questions & Answers #4

*Issued: July 11, 2016*

**RFP 16-005-78**

### **Random Drug Screenings for Specialty Court Participants**

#### **TO ALL PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS:**

**The following questions were submitted by a potential vendor. Our answer is listed in red below:**

1. Who is/are the current vendor(s) for these services? **HART Center and CAAP**
2. What are the fees you currently pay for these services? **\$16.25 per screen**
3. Is the current contract available for examination? If so, how can interested vendors obtain a copy? **The current contract is for treatment and screens, so it is not applicable to this RFP. Any County Contract is available through the public records request through the Shelby County Attorney Office.**
4. What is your policy with regard to any exceptions a vendor may have to the requirements in the RFP? (How should exceptions be noted in the vendor's proposal?) **We have put the requirements in the RFP because this is specifically what we need. You can list any exceptions in your proposal in any section you like.**
5. Is the County willing to accept an implementation period of 30-45 days from the date the notice to proceed is issued for services to begin? **Yes**
6. Will the County please provide the estimated (or historical) quantity of specimens collected and sent to the laboratory for testing, by specimen type?
  - a. Urine – **up to 38,000 per year**
  - b. Oral Fluid – **unknown, we have not had this service before**
  - c. Hair – **unknown, we have not had this service before**
7. Will the County please provide the estimated (or historical) positivity rate (i.e., the percentage of specimens screening positive for one drug, two drugs, and three or more drugs), by specimen type?
  - a. Urine- **3% positive for one or multiple drugs**
  - b. Oral Fluid – **unknown, we have not had this service before**
  - c. Hair – **unknown, we have not had this service before**

8. Section IX. Item 2.f. states that the Client Notification System must “allow the supervising case manager to post custom text-to-speech messages and appointment reminders for an individual donor or group of donors.” – Yes, it does and that is what we need.

a. Is the County willing to consider proposals from providers who do not currently offer this functionality? – No; the RFP states a minimum of 3 years’ experience.

b. Would the County be willing to allow six to twelve (6-12) months for the provider to develop and implement this capability? – No.

9. Section IX. Item 2.f. states that the provider must “allow donors to opt into an interactive text message notification in lieu of call-in notification.”

a. Is the County willing to consider proposals from providers who do not offer this functionality? – No.

b. In lieu of an interactive text messaging notification system, would the County consider a web-based check-in system (that can also be utilized on mobile devices/tablets) to be acceptable? No.

10. Section IX. Item 4. – Please confirm that the provider may utilize common carrier (UPS, FedEx) to pick up and transport specimens to the laboratory (as opposed to a dedicated “courier”). Yes.

11. Section IX. Item 5. – Please confirm that Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) certification refers to Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) National Laboratory Certification Program (NLCP) certification. Yes.

12. Section IX. Item 5.b. – We understand that the Court would like to be able to select from a variety of panels (up to 7 assays) plus EtG. Can the County please provide information regarding what its most commonly requested panels are for urine, oral fluid, and hair specimens?

a. Urine – this can be any combination of the drugs listed in the table and we cater the panel to the individual, so any combination can be requested.

b. Oral Fluid – unknown, we have not had this service before.

c. Hair – unknown, we have not had this service before.

13. Section IX. Item 5.c. states that the provider must “process a second screen on all positive immunoassay screens using a new aliquot of the specimen prior to reporting the positive specimen.” Performing a second immunoassay screen, even using a new aliquot, for specimens initially screening positive is of little to no value. Any substance(s) that caused a false positive in the initial screen will cause a false positive in the second screen. A second screen is not a valid verification or confirmation method, is not scientifically sound, and is not legally defensible. In sum, it is not appropriate and is strongly discouraged. The only scientifically valid and legally defensible way to confirm positive screens is with a chemically distinct confirmation method (e.g., GC/MS or LC-MS/MS). Paying for a second screen is a poor use of funds, and it is in the best interest of the County and the Court to modify its drug testing protocols accordingly. Will the County please agree to waive the requirement that a second immunoassay screen be performed on all positive specimens and defer to the provider’s expertise regarding the best ways to validate/confirm positive screens? The second screen is the confirmation, not another immunoassay.

14. Section IX. Item 5.d. states that results must be reported within one business day “following the specimen collection”. Industry standard is to measure result turnaround time based on when a specimen is received by the laboratory, not on when the specimen is collected. Will the County please consider amending this requirement to measure result turnaround time based on when a specimen is received by the testing laboratory? This is one day from the laboratory.

15. Section IX. Item 5.g. – will the County accept cut-off levels that may vary slightly from those indicated in the table in the RFP, as long as the levels comply with standards set forth by SAMHSA and/or agencies/accreditation bodies? **Possibly, it depends what they are.**

16. Section IX. Item 10. – Expert Testimony:

- a. How many times was in-person expert court testimony required in each of the last three (3) years? **- None**
- b. How many legal affidavits/litigation packages were required in each of the last three (3) years? **- None**
- c. Will the Court allow telephonic and/or live web-conference (e.g., Skype) testimony? **This depends on the individual judge, so there is not a definitive answer.**
- d. Will the provider be permitted to charge the County/Court for legal affidavits and/or expert testimony? **- No.**
- e. Will the provider be permitted to charge any other parties (e.g., the requesting party if not the Court or County) for legal affidavits and/or expert testimony? **- Unknown.**
- f. If the provider will be permitted to charge for legal support services, how should such proposed fees be presented in the provider's proposal? **– However the provider chooses to list fees in the proposal.**

17. Section IX. Item 12. – Training & Orientation Sessions:

- a. How many training and orientation sessions does the County expect to require each year? **– Not more than 2.**
- b. May the provider conduct these sessions via live webinar? **Yes.**
- c. If any of the sessions must be conducted in-person, how many in-person training and orientation sessions are expected to be required each year? **None of them are required to be in person.**

18. Section IX. Item 14. – Regarding the interface between the provider's web-based case management system and the state mandated TNWITS system described in this requirement:

- a. Can the TNWITS system use SOAP, CSV, or HL7 interfaces? **– You would have to contact the TNWITS company for this information.**
- b. Will the County please provide a definition of the data transfer method, file format, and data dictionary as soon as possible? **You can define what you will use for this.**
- c. Will the County agree to designate/provide a dedicated and responsive technical contact with availability to support the provider's development and validation efforts? **– No.**
- d. Will the County agree to sign a separate statement of work before the provider begins development of the interface to ensure both parties are in agreement about the functionality to be provided? **– No.**
- e. Will the County agree to allow 30-45 days from the date notice to proceed is issued for the interface to be developed and implemented? **- Yes**

19. Is there a preferred format for vendors' pricing proposals (e.g., a table that includes the services/features for which vendors are permitted to propose fees)? **Table**

20. Section XI. – does the County have a preference for proposals to be printed single or double-sided? **– No.**

21. Section XI. B.2. states that the package containing the proposal must be marked with the following: "CONFIDENTIAL, ELECTRONIC MONITORING, RFP #16-005-78". This appears to refer to a different RFP. Please confirm that it should instead be marked as follows: "CONFIDENTIAL, RANDOM DRUG SCREENINGS FOR SPECIALTY COURT PARTICIPANTS, RFP #16-005-78", as indicated on page 2 of the RFP.

Confirmed; yes, it should read "CONFIDENTIAL, RANDOM DRUG SCREENINGS FOR SPECIALTY COURT PARTICIPANTS, RFP #16-005-78", as indicated on page 2 of the RFP.

